



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/573,040	01/18/2007	Olli Matti Hynonen	P18503-US1	7677
27045	7590	08/04/2011		
ERICSSON INC. 6300 LEGACY DRIVE M/S EVR 1-C-11 PLANO, TX 75024				
EXAMINER				
JONES, PRENNELL P				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2467				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/04/2011		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

kara.coffman@ericsson.com  
jennifer.hardin@ericsson.com  
melissa.rhea@ericsson.com

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/573,040

**Applicant(s)**

HYNONEN ET AL.

**Examiner**

PRENELL JONES

**Art Unit**

2467

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 May 2011.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 8-11 and 13-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 15-20 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 9-11, 13 and 14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) 5 and 8 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-945)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
2. Applicant argues that the previously cited prior art of Elliott (USPGPUB 2002/0064149) fail to teach all the limitations of the claims.
3. In light of Applicant arguments, and an additional review of the Elliott prior art, Examiner withdraws previous rejection. However, Examiner has performed an additional search, which is utilized in the rejection that follows.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. **Claims 1, 3, 4, 9, 13 and 14** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sebestyen (US Patent 5,999,985) in view of Strauss et al (US Patent 5,790,173).

**Regarding claim 1, 3, 4, 9, 13 and 14, Sebestyen disclose** sending DTMF control signals over the circuit switched connection within H.245 protocol control messages/de-multiplex, data streams being multiplexed onto the circuit switched connection using the H.223 protocol (see Abstract, col. 3 and 4) at said network node, de-multiplexing the received data stream to recover the DTMF control signals (see col. 4, line 34-67, Sebestyen discloses playback (recovering) of received data).

Although Sebestyen is vague on the basis of said DTMF control signals, routing or re-routing the connection at an intelligent network node to an appropriate data source or mapping the connection to an appropriate data source, Strauss et al discloses redirecting calls at an intelligent peripherals (see col. 24, line 11-34, col. 25, line 8-21); Strauss further discloses video mail server (see fig 2, 4, 6, 7).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to be motivated to implement on the basis of said DTMF control signals, routing or re-routing the connection at an intelligent network node to an appropriate data source or mapping the connection to an appropriate data source as taught by Strauss with the combined teachings of Sebestyen and Strauss for the purpose of further providing coherent communication in a multimedia communicating environment.

**Regarding claim 9, Sebestyen** further discloses wherein said data source is a peer H.324 or H.232 user terminal (see Fig. 1,2, line 63-67).

7. **Claim 10 and 11** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sebestyen (US Patent 5,999,985) in view of Strauss et al (US Patent 5,790,1730) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Elliott (USPGPUB 2002/0064149).

Regarding claim 10, claim 10 include all the limitation of claim 1 except streaming server of voice mail server.

In analogous art, Elliott discloses utilizing video streamers, video servers and video-mail servers for providing additional services to the user (see paragraph 1276, 2198, 2243 and 2297).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to be motivated to implement utilizing streaming server or video mail server as taught by Elliott with the combined teachings of Sebestyen and Strauss for the purpose of further providing coherent communication in a multimedia communicating environment.

**Claim 11** contain all the limitation of claim 1 except the circuit switched connections is terminated to URL identifying data source.

In analogous art, Elliott discloses utilizing URL for mapping directory data associated in a circuit switch environment (see paragraphs 1377, 1378, 1490, 1673, 1835 and 1838)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to be motivated to implement utilizing a circuit switched connections is terminated to URL identifying data source as taught by Elliott with the combined teachings of Sebestyen and

Strauss for the purpose of further providing coherent communication in a multimedia communicating environment.

8. **Claim 2 is rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sebestyen (US Patent 5,999,985) in view of Strauss et al (US Patent 5,790,1730) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Cave et al (US PGPUB 2001/005382).

**Regarding claim 2**, claim 2 includes all the limitations of claim 1 except for sending DTMF control signals within H.245 UUI messages.

In analogous are Cave discloses input DTMF/user input indication (UUI) control signaling messages while providing teleconferencing services (see paragraph 0021, 0026 and 0027).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to be motivated to implement sending DTMF control signals within H.245 UUI messages as taught by Cave with the combined teachings of Sebestyen and Strauss for the purpose of further maintaining control of calls.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

9. Claims 15-20 allowed over prior art.
10. Claims 5 and 8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

11. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The prior art fail to teach the particular limitation in combination with all the other limitation of the claim **with respect to claim 5**, at the intelligent network, re-routing a call to a phone number located on a video gateway on the basis of a DTMF signal contained in an H.245 control message received at the Intelligent network node, **with respect to claim 8**, intelligent network node determining on the basis of a DTMF signal contained within forward H.245 messages, an address of a packet switched data source to which the circuit switched connection should be connected, **with respect to claim 15**, mapping the DTMF signals to associated telephone numbers terminating at video gateway, **with respect to claim 16**, mapping DTMF signals to an address of packet switched data sources and coupling the circuit switched connection to data source over a packet switched network, **with respect to claim 17**, receiving H.245 stream to recover H.223 messages containing DTMF control signals, and forwarding these H.223 control messages to a service node, **with respect to claim 18**, recovering from the H.245 control messages DTMF control signals provided by a user terminal, mapping DTMF control signals to an address, **with respect to claim 19**; routing circuit switched signaling t an Intelligent network, IN, node, with user initiated DTMF signals being contained within H.245 messages; and **with respect to claim 20**, at an intelligent network node, selecting a telephone number allocated to a video gateway, and sending a call setup message from a intelligent network node to a telephone number and establishing a circuit switched connection between a terminal and video

gateway and at the video gateway identifying a packet switched network address associated with phone number.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Prenell P. Jones whose telephone number is 571-272-3180. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hassan Phillips can be reached on 571-272-3490. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Prenell P. Jones

July 28, 2011

/Prenell P Jones/

Examiner, Art Unit 2467

/HASSAN PHILLIPS/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2467